

High Energy Neutrino Telescopes Detect Supernovae

F. Halzen, J. E. Jacobsen

Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison WI 53706

E. Zas

Departamento de Física de Partículas, Universidad de Santiago

E-15706 Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Abstract

We have simulated the response of a high energy neutrino telescope to the stream of low energy neutrinos produced by a supernova. The nominal threshold of such detectors is in the GeV energy range. The passage of a large flux of MeV neutrinos during a period of seconds will nevertheless be detected as an excess of single counting rates in all individual optical modules. Detectors under construction, which consist of roughly 200 modules, will be able to detect a galactic supernova at or above the 5σ level. The rate of fake signals is, however, too large for the telescope to serve as a neutrino watch. Such capability requires detectors with roughly 3 times the number of optical modules, thus within easy reach of the next generation detectors.

The neutrino events detected in the Kamiokande[1], IMB[2], Baksan[3] and LSD[4] detectors prior to the optical discovery of supernova 1987A represented a most remarkable birth of neutrino astronomy. Despite observation by four experiments, the data has left us with a variety of questions and uncertainties. Most prominent is our inability to understand the time of the Mont Blanc neutrino burst[4] and the directionality of the IMB events[5]. This underscores the importance of collecting as much information as possible when presented with the rare opportunity of observing the next nearby supernova. We here show that high energy neutrino detectors, presently under construction[6], can observe the neutrino bursts from galactic supernovae even though they have nominal thresholds of GeV energy, i.e. almost three orders of magnitude above the MeV energy of supernova neutrinos. Simultaneous detection of supernova neutrinos, together with other devoted experiments[6], will help overall statistics. Good relative timing between different experiments may allow the determination of the location of the supernova if it is shielded from us by large amounts of matter.

First generation high energy neutrino telescopes consist of approximately 200 optical modules (OM) deployed in deep, clear water or ice shielded from cosmic rays. Coincident signals between the OMs detect the Čerenkov light of muons with energy in excess of a few GeV. Also electromagnetic showers initiated by very high energy electron neutrinos are efficiently detected. The idea has been debated for some time whether these instruments have the capability to detect the neutrinos from a supernova despite the fact that they are in the MeV range. The production of copious numbers of positrons of tens of MeV energy in the interaction of $\bar{\nu}_e$ with hydrogen, will suddenly yield signals in all OMs for the 10 seconds duration of the burst. Clearly such a signal, no matter how weak, will become statistically significant for a sufficient number of OMs. We here perform a complete simulation of the signal and its detection and conclude that the 200 OMs of detectors such as DUMAND and AMANDA are sufficient to establish the occurrence of a neutrino burst in coincidence with the optical display of a supernova. We also show that the same detectors can actually serve as a supernova watch, i.e. a “fake” signal occurs less than once a century, by increasing the number of OMs by a factor of three. This is much less than the roughly 7000 OMs which are projected for a next-generation detector[7].

Although aspects of the observations of SN1987A left some lingering doubts about su-

pernova models[4, 5], they remarkably confirmed the established ideas for the supernova mechanisms[8]. At collapse the core is expected to release energy in a prompt ν_e burst lasting a few milliseconds. Most of the energy is however liberated after deleptonization in a burst lasting about ten seconds. Roughly equal energies are carried by each neutrino species. The time scale corresponds to the thermalization of the neutrinosphere and its diffusion within the dense core[9]. Since the $\bar{\nu}_e$ cross-section[10] for the inverse beta decay reaction on protons exceeds the characteristic cross sections for the other neutrino flavors, $\bar{\nu}_e$ events dominate by a large factor after including detection efficiency. In this reaction free protons absorb the antineutrino to produce a neutron and a positron which is isotropically emitted with an energy close to that of the initial neutrino. For the purpose of this letter we use typical parameters, derived from SN1987 observations, which are consistent with those previously estimated in supernova models. From the energy distributions of the observed events the average temperature of the neutrino sphere in SN1987A was deduced to be 4.0 MeV[8].

Before discussing our detailed Monte Carlo simulation we present a back-of-the-envelope derivation of our final result. After convoluting the 4 MeV thermal Fermi distribution of the neutrinos with a detection cross section rising with the square of the neutrino energy, one obtains an event distribution peaked in the vicinity of 20 MeV. The tracklength of a 20 MeV positron is roughly 10 centimeters and therefore over 3000 Čerenkov photons are produced. This number combined with a typical quantum efficiency of 25 % leaves 800 detected photons in each event. Assuming these are emitted within π steradians, i.e. roughly the size of the Čerenkov cone, the detection probability becomes a simple function of both the module collection area A_M and the distance to the positron shower R :

$$P(R) = \min \left[\frac{800 A_M}{\pi R^2}, 1 \right] \quad (1)$$

For $R^2 < R_d^2$ ($\simeq 250 A_M$) the phototube will most likely trigger on the positron while for larger R the probability diminishes rapidly. By evaluating the effective volume within a cone of π steradians with vertex at each OM, we obtain an approximate expression for the detection volume associated with OMs:

$$V_{eff} \sim \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{R_{att}} P(R) R^2 dR$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sim \frac{1}{4} \frac{\pi}{3} R_d^3 + \frac{1}{4} \int_{R_d}^{R_{att}} 800 A_M dR \\
&\sim \frac{\pi}{12} R_d^3 + 200 A_M (R_{att} - R_d).
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here we have integrated up to the attenuation length R_{att} of the medium and divided by a factor of 4 in order to average over all orientations of the Čerenkov cone. We conservatively assumed that the OM has 2π acceptance. It is interesting to note that the effective volume is proportional to both the collection area of the OM and the attenuation length. It is quite insensitive to the solid angle over which the Čerenkov photons are distributed (π). For OMs such as those used in the AMANDA detector with collecting area $A_M = 0.028 \text{ m}^2$ and an attenuation length $R_{att} = 25 \text{ m}$ typical of ice[11], we obtain $V_{eff} \sim 130 \text{ m}^3$. This result can be used to rescale SN1987 observations to a supernova at a distance d_{kpc} . From 11 events observed in 2.14 kton Kamiokande detector we predict:

$$N_{Events} \sim 11 N_M \left[\frac{\rho V_{eff}}{2.14 \text{ kton}} \right] \left[\frac{52 \text{ kpc}}{d_{kpc}} \right]^2 \tag{3}$$

for a detector with N_M optical modules. For a 130 m^3 effective volume of each of the 200 OMs we obtain 5300 events.

We now require a meaningful detection of this signal in the presence of the continuous background counting rate of all phototubes. Over the 10 s duration of the delayed neutrino burst from a supernova, the rms fluctuations of the combined noise from all the OMs is:

$$\sigma_{1p.e.} = \sqrt{10 \nu_{1p.e.} N_M} \tag{4}$$

where the background counting rate in each module at the 1 photoelectron level is represented by $\nu_{1p.e.}$. The probability that the noise in the OMs fakes a supernova signal can be estimated assuming Poisson statistics. The expected rate of supernova explosions in our galaxy is about $2 \times 10^{-2} \text{ y}^{-1}$. If the detector is to perform a supernova watch we must require that the frequency of fake signals is well below this rate. The signal should therefore exceed $n_\sigma \geq 6$ which corresponds to a probability of 9.9×10^{-10} . The corresponding number of 10 seconds intervals indeed exceeds a century. Clearly the requirement can be relaxed if we just demand that the detector can make a measurement in the presence of independent confirmation. For an average noise rate of 1 kHz, a typical value for the OMs in AMANDA, the rms fluctuation of the 20 million hits expected in an interval of ten seconds is 1400. This implies that

detection of a galactic supernova is near the 4σ level for the 200 module configuration, while detection should not represent a problem for the next generation detector which consists of 7,000 OMs. Since the signal in the present detector is marginal, it is necessary to do a more realistic calculation of the event rate. We will conclude that our rough estimate is somewhat conservative.

Background noise in the modules clearly plays a critical role so that low noise environments such as ice have an intrinsic advantage. Furthermore, the noise is expected to be reduced drastically at the 2 photoelectron level. This will unfortunately also imply a reduction in effective volume for event detection as we will see further on. Signal to noise is proportional to the ratio $V_{eff}/\sqrt{\nu}$. Obviously increased attenuation length in the medium and larger effective area of the OM results in an enhanced effective volume. Considering parameters appropriate for DUMAND, an attenuation length of 40 m in water and OMs with double diameter, we expect a factor 10 increase in effective volume per optical module. This should readily compensate for a noise rate higher by a factor 100. We therefore expect DUMAND and AMANDA to have comparable sensitivity as supernova detectors.

For a complete calculation we have combined a detailed electromagnetic shower Monte Carlo, initially developed to evaluate the radio emission by cascades in ice[12], with the AMANDA Monte Carlo. The shower Monte Carlo is a fast three dimensional routine which simulates the dominant low energy processes: Møller, Bhabha and Compton scattering as well as electron-positron annihilation, continuous energy loss and multiple elastic scattering as well as the bremsstrahlung and pair production processes which dominate at high energy. We added the capability to simulate the emission of Čerenkov photons by cascade particles. Our event file consists of over 10,000 events sampled from a 4 MeV temperature Fermi-Dirac neutrino distribution weighed by a cross section rising with the square of the neutrino energy. Photon detection is simulated using the AMANDA Monte Carlo to correctly account for the effects of attenuation in deep polar ice, optical module efficiency as a function of photon wavelength and detector geometry[13].

The final result can be quoted as an effective volume for the entire detector of $23,000\text{ m}^3 \pm 2,000$ for the first stage AMANDA configuration of 10 strings arranged in a nine 30 m side polygon with one at the center. Each string has 20 modules spaced at 10 m intervals[14]. We therefore obtain an effective volume of 115 m^3 per module, close to our crude estimate. Single

OMs have a lower threshold than the Kamiokande and IMB experiments which reconstruct Čerenkov cones. This is taken into account by correction factors multiplying the event rates to be entered in Eq. (3), which we evaluated to be 1.4 (5.4) for Kamiokande (IMB). We thus obtain 7700 (9070) events in the 200 modules of the 9+1 configuration of AMANDA. A trigger could be implemented by monitoring the sum of all singles rates in ~ 1 s. intervals, and requiring positive fluctuations in this sum for several such intervals.

At the 2 p.e. level we obtain an effective volume of $5,900 \text{ m}^3 \pm 1,400$. If the OM's noise rate is reduced by over a factor 16, signal-to-noise will actually be improved by working at the 2 p.e. level. Clearly the statistical significance of the signal will be improved by including information from higher level triggers.

Typical noise rate for AMANDA modules imply that $\sigma_{1p.e.} \sim 1400$. The calculated event rates for a supernova bursts in the center of the galaxy therefore correspond to a 5.4 (6.4) sigma effect when rescaling the observed signals from SN1987A at Kamiokande (IMB). This should provide a sufficiently clean signal. We can combine Eqs. (2) and (3), including the correction factor, to obtain the expected signal:

$$n_{\sigma} = 0.35 \sqrt{N_M} \left[\frac{10^2}{\sqrt{10} \nu_{1p.e.}} \right] \left[\frac{V_{eff}}{125 \text{ m}^3} \right] \left[\frac{8 \text{ kpc}}{d_{kpc}} \right]^2 \quad (5)$$

We here scaled to the Kamiokande event number. The constant is 0.42 for IMB. The results are encouraging since a AMANDA supernova watch can be performed at the 6-sigma level with only 340 (240) optical modules according to Kamiokande (IMB) observations of SN1987A. A next-generation detector with over 7,000 modules should provide a sharp signal for a supernova at the galactic center and should operate as a supernova watch to twice the distance to the galactic center, i.e. covering all the galactic disk.

We end with a warning about the statistics. Clearly in a realistic analysis penalty factors will be associated with various trials made to identify a burst. This will, however, not alter our positive conclusions. A modest increase the number of OMs can absorb the effect of a large number of trials, e.g. associated with a sliding window to identify the 10 seconds burst.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to J. Hauptman, R. Morse and J. Learned for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the University of Wisconsin Research Committee with funds granted by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-76ER00881, in part by the Texas National Research Laboratory Commission under Grant No. RGFY93-221 and in part by the “Comité Conjunto Hispano-Norteamericano” and CICYT.

References

- [1] K. Hirata, T. Kajita, M. Koshiba *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58** (1987) 1490; *Phys. Rev.* **D38** (1988) 448.
- [2] R.M. Bionta, G. Blewitt, C.B. Bratton, D. Casper, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58** (1987) 1494.
- [3] E.N. Alekseev, L.N. Alekseeva, V.I. Volchenko, I.V. Krivosheina, *Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **45** (1987) 461.
- [4] M. Aglietta, G. Badino, G. Bologna, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58** (1987) 1490; *Europhys. Lett.* **319** (1987) 136.
- [5] C.B. Bratton *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D37** (1988) 3361.
- [6] J.G. Learned, *Proc. of the 13th European Cosmic Ray Symposium*; Geneva 1992, CERN (1992), and references therein.
- [7] F. Halzen and J.G. Learned, *Proc. of the Fifth International Symposium on Neutrino Telescopes*, Venice (1993), ed. M. Baldo-Ceolin.
- [8] H.A. Bethe, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **62** (1990) 801-866.
- [9] A. Burrows, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **40** (1990) 181-212.
- [10] D.N. Schramm, *Comments Nucl. Part. Phys.* **17** (1987) 239-278.
- [11] T. Miller *et al.*, *to appear in Proc. of the 23rd Int. Cosmic Ray Conference, Calgary (1993)*.
- [12] E. Zas, F. Halzen and T. Stanev, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) 362.
- [13] S. Tilav *et al.*, *to appear in Proc. of the 23rd Int. Cosmic Ray Conference, Calgary (1993)*.
- [14] D.M. Lowder *et al.*, *to appear in Proc. of the 23rd Int. Cosmic Ray Conference, Calgary (1993)*.